

REMARKS

The title has been changed to “Method of fabricating a thin film integrated circuit with thick film resistors,” according to the examiner’s suggestion.

Claims 1, 2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Brown et al. Claims 3, 4 and 6-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. or Brown et al. together with Jo et al. or Lauffer et al.

Applicant has canceled claims 1, 3, 4 and 10 and has amended claim 2 to independent form. As amended, claim 2 recites “multiple pairs of conductive electrodes as terminals of thick film resistors on a substrate, wherein the two conductive electrodes of the same pair **are separated by a distance and extend parallel to each other.**” In contrast, Fig. 1 of Brown et al. shows a thick film resistor comprising a circular terminal (22) and an annular terminal (24) surrounding the circular terminal (22). The two terminals (22, 24) are separated by an annular-shaped region (23). In other words, the two terminals are concentric.

The drawback of the thick film resistor with concentric terminals as taught by Brown et al. is that the circular resistor needs a larger area on the substrate. Therefore, the circular configuration taught by Brown et al. is not favorable for fabrication of small printed circuit boards (PCB) with high-density passive elements.

In contrast, the resistor called for in amended claim 2 has spaced apart conductive electrodes that extend parallel to each other and therefore may be smaller so as to allow a great many resistors to be fabricated on a PCB. None of the cited references discloses the thick film resistor as recited in amended claim 2 with two terminals extending parallel to each other. Therefore, the combination of references suggested by the examiner does not result in applicant’s claimed subject matter.

As a result of the foregoing, applicant submits that claims 2 and 5-9 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels would best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

No fee, other than the enclosed \$60.00 fee for a one-month extension is deemed necessary in connection with the filing of this Amendment. If any such fee is required, authorization is hereby given to charge the amount of any such fee to Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

Dated: February 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

William E. Pelton, Esq.

Reg. No. 25,702

Cooper & Dunham LLP

1185 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036

(212) 278-0400

Attorneys for Applicant